HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XLIV JULY, 1951 NUMBER 3

NVMEN AND MANA

HERBERT JENNINGS ROSE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, FIFE, SCOTLAND

SOME time ago I wrote a little book on Roman religion which was favored with a courteous and thoughtful review by a scholar from whom I have learned much, S. Weinstock.[1] My central contention was that the Romans had an idea corresponding closely to the Melanesian and Polynesian *mana*, the North American *orenda* or *wakanda*, and similar notions elsewhere, and that they denoted it by the word *numen*; that is to say, that *numen* signifies a superhuman force, impersonal in itself but regularly belonging to a person (a god of some kind) or occasionally to an exceptionally important body of human beings, as the Roman senate or people. This force, I argued, the Romans supposed could be to some extent directed to serve their own ends; a god could be induced to employ his *numen* for such things as giving fertility or victory to his worshippers, and on occasion an inanimate object, such as a boundary-mark, could have *numen* put into it by the appropriate ceremonial. Also, the *numen* of a god could be and was increased by offering him a sacrifice of the proper kind.

In all this I was saying nothing new. I had long ago suggested that *numen* meant something very like *mana*,[2] and a like explanation of Roman religious phenomena had been entertained by several scholars, notably by F. Pfister in his authoritative article on *numen* in Pauly-Wissowa.[3] My critic, however, opposes five serious objections to the position I had taken up. I propose to enumerate and deal with them.

[1] H. J. Rose, Ancient Roman Religion, London, Hutchinson, 1949. Reviewed in J.R.S. xxxix (1949), 166–67.

[2] Primitive Culture in Italy (London, Methuen, 1926), 7.

[3] Realenc. xvii, 1273–91. I had independently reached conclusions very like his in this Review, xxviii (1935), 237 sqq., neither of us being then aware that the other was working on this subject.

He urges, firstly, that the word *numen* is not found earlier than Accius; secondly, that it "is not used in old prayers and in relevant antiquarian texts nor, for instance, in the Arval Acts"; thirdly, that "it still denotes occasionally 'nodding, inclination' in Cicero and Lucretius"; fourthly, that "religious usage begins to prevail" at the same time, i.e., in the last century of the Republic, and so we often find *numen Iouis, deorum* or the like, sometimes joined to other words, such as *uis*, but (fifthly) "the predication that something or somebody is or has a *numen* does not occur until the Augustan period." His conclusion is that if there was such an idea as *mana* in early Rome, *numen* is not the word for it, for *numen* is a relatively late term, which had no religious meaning before Augustus, and owes what religious significance it has to the need for a Latin equivalent of Greek technicalities (Weinstock says, of δαίμων, I should rather suppose of δύναμις in its Hellenistic sense, for δαίμων is commonly Latinized as *genius*). Hence the various passages where Latin uses *numen* and a Polynesian or Melanesian, if he wrote in his own language on the same subject or translated the classical authors, would presumably say *mana* are no evidence for primitive Roman ideas, but only for the theological speculations current in and after the days of Cicero.

Two questions seem to arise here. The first, and I think much the less important, is whether *numen* in the sense of superhuman power is an old or a comparatively new word. The second, which is fundamental for any scientific explanation of the earliest recoverable religious ideas in Rome, is whether the concept existed in early times, let the name for it be what it may. For if the Romans believed from early times in something like *mana*, but either originally found no word for it or changed its name somewhere about 170 B.C., the date of Accius' birth, that is an interesting and curious linguistic fact, but does not tell us very much about their religion. If, on the other hand, they really had no such concept in early days, the development of their cult and belief was quite different from what, among others, Professor Wagenvoort and I believe it to have been, and a new explanation must be sought for a large group of fundamentally important phenomena. However, the linguistic and the religious facts have certainly some kind of connection, so it is well worth while to

begin by asking what we know about the word *numen*. The materials have been most conveniently assembled by Pfister in the article already mentioned, and Weinstock's summary of them is adequate and fair.

Firstly, then, we do not find the word in our earliest documents. These include the comedies of Plautus, and in one at least of these it would not be surprising to find *numen* a time or two, if not oftener. Juppiter and Mercurius, in the Amphitruo, have taken the outward forms of Amphitruo and Sosia, and Mercurius explains at some length that they have done so (Amph. 115 sqq.). If he said that he and Juppiter had performed this miracle by their *numen*, it would be in accordance with later usage, but he does not; Juppiter can make himself a *uorsipellis* when he likes (123), and in general can do what he chooses (139). Mercurius has taken on Sosia's form (124), and gives no details of how he did it, merely saying that the resemblance is perfect and deceives all the household. In the last scene of the play, Bromia runs on with a long tale of the wonders attending the birth of the twins, especially of Hercules (1057 sqq.). The thunder makes her think it likely that Juppiter has had a hand in it, but she never mentions his *numen*. Later, the god himself appears and explains it all, in particular exonerating Alcumena, because *mea ui subactast facere*. *Vis* is a word later to be found conjoined closely with *numen* (Cicero, Verr. ii, 4, 107 for instance), but here it lacks its companion.

However, in the case of Plautus we have to remember that the source of his plots and of the general outlines at least of his handling is Greek, and fourth-century Greek at that. Its gods are not beings to be taken very seriously; they, like the human actors, are figures of a sophisticated comic drama, and reverence for them is not expected nor forthcoming. I question if any pious Roman saw much more than identity of name between the Juppiter who takes his pleasure with Plautus' Alcumena and the Iuppiter Optimus Maximus of the Capitol. It is more to the point to observe that so far as our fragments go, *numen* was not a word used by Ennius in his national epic. He no doubt handled his divine figures with the decorum proper to serious poetry and had something to say of their power; therefore the apparent absence

from him of a word belonging to reverent mentions of deities and their activities is a point in favor of those who suppose that it did not then exist, or at least had no such specialized sense as in Virgil's *quo numine laeso* or *apparent . . . numina magna deum.*[4] But even in Ennius Greek influence is strong, despite the thoroughly patriotic tone of his work, and it would seem that his personal views on religious matters were in accordance with the latest Euhemeristic theories, which he made known to a Latin-reading public, whereas Virgil, whatever his own beliefs were by the time he composed his greater works, had a strong love of the old pieties [5] and shows not only conventional respect for the traditional deities but a sympathetic understanding of the minds of those to whom they and their potency were very real.

That *numen* is absent from liturgical contexts is, I believe, true. At all events, it does not occur in the word-index to Rohde's monograph on the *libri pontificales* [6] and I can recall no text of a prayer or other religious formula which employs it. This is interesting, but not really very much in point. It was simply not a liturgical word, but part of the vocabulary of what may perhaps, without prejudging any questions, be called theological thought, whether late or early, popular or learned. Here we must not forget a decided difference between Roman liturgical language and that of a Christian Church. If we look at any such document as the Book of Common Prayer, we shall find abundance of terms taken from dogmatic theology, such as "redemption," "oblation," "satisfaction," "resurrection," "the world to come," "life everlasting," and so forth, for the foundation of the whole ritual is a highly developed theory concerning the relations of God to mankind. But, as is well known, no such foundation exists for either classical Greek or classical Roman cult; the prayers are straightforward requests, couched in formal and reverential terms, for certain benefits to the worshippers or for harm to be inflicted on their enemies. How or by what means the deities addressed are to fulfil these petitions is left entirely to their own discretion, with

[4] A.i, 8; ii, 623.

[5] Especially G.ii, 493.

[6] G. Rohde, Die Kultsatzungen der römischen Pontifices, Berlin, Töpelmann, 1936, p. 177.

no hint of what means they are to employ. My impression is that if Homer's Chryses [7] had been using a real liturgical formula for his prayer to Apollo, he would not even have suggested that the god should take vengeance on the Achaians σοῖσι βέλεσσιν, and certainly that a pious Roman priest would have avoided all such expression as *uti tu morbos uisos inuisosque numine tuo defendas auerruncesque*.[8] If asked, however, how the god was to save his worshipper from ailments of all sorts, he might very well have given his opinion that he did it by the exercise of *numen*, always supposing that the word was in current use.

The third point seems to me of very little importance. Cicero and Lucretius, rightly or wrongly, connected the substantive *numen* with the verb *nuere*, and so used it as an equivalent of Greek νεῦσις. This indicates that the word need not, at all events by writers of great originality who, like all such, pay attention to the etymologies of words and their possibilities of varied, sometimes new, meanings, be used only of supernatural power, or the result of such power. We have already (above, p. 111) seen *uis* used of the power of a deity,[9] but notoriously it can be used of many other things than divine activities, indeed it more commonly signifies the strength, or violence, of a man or beast. *Numen* gravitates in another direction, being used mostly of the divine, but is not wholly limited to that sphere. So far, therefore, from holding with Weinstock that the "religious usage began to prevail" in the last century of the Republic, I would say that the "religious" usage was the normal one, but that now and then a good author allowed himself to employ the word in other contexts as well. The rest of Weinstock's remarks at this point, that *numen* "expresses the power of a divinity, but only if the latter is added in the genitive or represented by the possessive pronoun" is neither here nor there; on any theory of the date and original meaning of the word, how else could anyone at any time have expressed such an idea?

He states finally, and it is quite true, that until the Augustan age no one is ever said to be or to have *numen*. As to the latter

[7] A 42.

[8] Cf. Cato, de agricult. 141, 2.

[9] Another very good instance is Lucretius i, 13.

part of the statement, I answer that to use the possessive genitive with *numen* implies possession; if there is *numen Iouis*, then, whether anyone says so or not, *Iuppiter numen habet*. That no one calls Juppiter or any other god a *numen* until Augustus proves that about his time some had forgotten exactly what the word meant, and it had gone through a modification very like that which "Deity" and "Providence" have undergone with us, from impersonal to personal, although in the case of the Latin word of course not from abstract to concrete as well, for it can never have been an abstract noun, as its formation shows. Here, by the way, it seems to differ from *mana* grammatically. That word, although in the languages of its native Pacific it apparently can be both substantive and adjective, yet if the former, is something like one of our abstracts, meaning "superior or victorious force." [10] *Numen* on the other hand is of a formation which means something done, as *flamen* (neut.) means a blast of wind, a result of the wind blowing, *nomen* is the result of calling someone something, and so forth.

To sum up, the linguistic evidence does not prove that *numen* is a very old word, and leaves it open to us to suppose that it was invented about the second century B.C. to express an idea then current. On the other hand, there is little to disprove that the word is of hoary antiquity; we do not find it in certain early authors who might have used it, and that is all. But let us assume that *numen* is a comparatively late word, invented if we like to think so by Accius himself. We are now left with the far more important question, whether or not that which *numen* signifies, a power, or more accurately a result of the existence of power, impersonal but normally attached to a person, generally a god, was current in early Rome. For convenience, and to avoid begging Latin linguistic questions (a thing I am always loath to do, as I do not profess to be an expert in etymology), let us refer to this power as *mana*. Is the balance of evidence in favor of supposing that the ancestors of the classical Romans had such a concept, and that it was fundamental to their religious ideas?

Let us once more take the familiar test-case of Terminus. We

[10] See Father W. Schmidt, Origin and Growth of Religion (London, 1931), p. 161, and refs. there.

have to take our facts from sources much too late for us to assume hastily that they preserve original native ideas, Ovid and the agrimensores. Fortunately, we have at least a little information from other sources to check what they tell us. Ovid [11] states in so many words that Terminus is a stock or a stone, and yet has *numen*, which to him means simply, I think, that Terminus is a god like other and greater beings; for whatever *numen* may have meant originally and whatever its date, I do not look to a popular poet of the beginning of the Christian era for information about the feelings of the oldest Romans. The interesting thing is that he absolutely identifies the god and the material object which marks off one estate from another: *siue lapis siue es defossus in agro stipes, ab antiquis tu quoque numen habes.* Now Accius, Varro and apparently some Latin landowners who laid no claim to antiquarian scholarship seem to have known that the proper name for a boundary-mark was not *terminus*, but *termen*,[12] the exact etymological equivalent of τέρμα, the word which the Greeks, who had no cult exactly like that of Terminus, continued to use for a limit or limit-mark of any kind, real or metaphorical.[13] How, then, did a *termen* become a Terminus, which is properly an adjective from that substantive? Siculus Flaccus, unless I gravely misunderstand him, gives us the answer,[14] and that in a passage which contains no theological or other speculations, for he is a practical land-surveyor, but merely states what the old custom was in erecting a boundary-stone. "When they (the ancients) were setting *termini* in place," he says, "they used to stand the stones themselves upright on unbroken soil close to those spots in which they meant to dig holes and fix them. They adorned the stones with ointment, hangings (*uelaminibus*) and garlands. In the holes in which they were going to set them, after making a sacrifice and killing the victim and burning it on blazing

[11] Ovid, Fasti ii, 641–42. He is not there describing the erection of a terminus but the annual rites held at it.

[12] Varro, L. L. v, 21: in Latio aliquot locis dicitur, ut apud Accium, non terminus sed termen.

[13] See L.S.J.s.u. It is of course true that they sometimes, but not in classical prose, took the first step towards personifying the mark and called it a limiter (τέρμων) not a limit. But apart from a passage or two which discuss Roman matters, no one is said to regard a τέρμων as anything like a god.

[14] De condicionibus agrorum, p. 141 Lachmann.

billets, they dribbled the blood (of the victim) with covered heads, and threw incense and grain therein. In addition, they threw into the holes honeycombs, wine and other things with which it is usual to perform the rites in honor of Terminus. When the fire had consumed all the food-offerings (*dapibus*), they set the stones in place over the still warm remains and fixed them with great care." That, our author explains, is why the one certain way of identifying a boundary-mark as such is to find coals or ashes under it. Now that the old custom has died out, there is apparently no really reliable test.

Siculus Flaccus' statements are perfectly clear, though here and there the poor condition of his MSS. makes it not quite certain how he worded them; the sense at least is not in doubt. It remains therefore to accept his facts, which presumably he got from some reliable source, for they are of importance to his profession, and which he had no possible motive to falsify. Having done so, we may proceed to ask what the people in question were doing when they performed their archaic ritual. Unlike the landholders in Ovid, they were not offering sacrifice to Terminus, although the materials used were the same, for Terminus was not yet there to be sacrificed to. Juppiter one might worship wherever the sky or its clouds were visible, Mars whenever there was war or agriculture, but Vesta must be invoked at her hearth, Janus at his door or gate (save when they form part of a whole indigitation of gods called upon collectively), the Penates somewhere near the store-cupboard, Terminus at his boundary-mark; and as yet there is no boundary-mark there, only an ordinary stone, in no way sacred or remarkable. The answer is fairly plain if we remember what, according to the sacred formulae of the Romans themselves, was the object of a sacrifice, as expressed in the word *macte*.[15] After some hesitation, it is generally decided now that this is an invitation (one can hardly say a command) to be "increased" by the sacrifice. But in what can the god addressed be "increased," save in power, presumably by receiving the life of the victim, certainly by being fed on such holy food as its duly consecrated flesh, or the cereal offerings, also duly consecrated, which may replace or accompany it? Now the setters up of a properly consti-

[15] See C.Q. xxxii, 57 sqq., 220 sqq.; xxxv, 52 sqq.; xxxvi, 15 sqq.

tuted boundary-mark do those things which normal sacrificers do, save that apparently they have no sacrificial meal, for themselves or for any god. The victim, says the author, is consumed on blazing billets, *hostia immolata adque incensa facibus ardentibus*, and its blood is dribbled into the hole in the ground prepared for the reception of the stone. Bloodless offerings are added and the whole burned. Nothing is said of the usual boiling of the *exta* nor their "porrection" on a sacrificial platter; the whole apparently is used up in the ritual. Into the hole which presumably is "increased" by these means, the stone is put, and henceforth it is no longer a *lapis*, nor even a mere *termen*, but a Terminus, a veritable, if petty, god, to whom annual worship is properly due, no doubt with the intention of giving him more power, call it *numen* or what you will, in case the responsible task of keeping the peace between neighbors has tired him in the past twelvemonth. He also has the protection due to holy things and persons if in danger from sacrilegious hands: *Numa Pompilius statuit*, says Festus, i.e., there was a ritual law which had existed from time immemorial, *eum qui terminum exarasset et ipsum et boues sacros esse*.[16] But how has this change from a lump of stone to a divine object taken place? I can conceive no line of thought likely to occur to an early Roman but the one I have outlined above; the ritual performed had put some sort of virtue into the homely visible thing, and now it had, I would say, *numen*; but if it were proved, as it is merely a tenable hypothesis, that no such word existed in their vocabulary, I am not disposed to quarrel over a purely verbal matter. It is true that we have not the words of the prayer or charm they used, if, as seems highly probable, they did use one; but I cannot think they were conjuring a spirit into the stone, an idea wholly foreign to early Roman cult so far as we know it, and as already said, there seems to have been no god present for them to pray to. It seems to me illegitimate to compare a Christian or Jewish service of consecration, whether of a church or some other material object. Solomon in his day,[17] a

[16] Festus p. 505, 20 Lindsay.

[17] 2 Chron. 6, 18. The prayer put into Solomon's mouth is of course part of a late document. That the omnipresence of Yahweh was not an idea accepted by all and sundry is plain, e.g., from Jonah's attempt to run away from him, Jon. 1,3; it belongs to the higher developments of Hebrew religion.

Christian ecclesiastic in ours, address a Being whom they suppose omnipresent and therefore capable of hearing what they say at any time and in any place, and also of bestowing His especial grace on the newly-erected place of worship, or whatever it may be. Roman gods of anything like the earliest period were no such exalted deities.

Passing from Terminus, let us consider what another and more important set of Romans were doing when they performed their traditional ceremonies; I mean the Arval Brothers. There is a phrase which recurs more than once in the encouragingly full descriptions of their rites which have come down to us.[18] It is, *fruges uirides et aridas contigerunt*. There are it is true a number of passages in which these priests are said to have touched or laid their hands upon sundry objects, for instance *pulmenta*,[19] and it is often to be understood that they are consecrating them or otherwise employing them in the service of their goddess. But here they touch two sets of things, the old grain and the new. Why, unless by virtue of their holy office they are acting as sort of spiritual conductors and transferring something from the crop of last year to the present harvest, soon to be cut? And what can this something be but the *mana* or power, call it *numen* or what you will, which was present the year before to make the corn grow and is wanted to cause an abundant yield again? It seems to me most unlikely that anything personal, such as a corn-spirit, is meant to be conveyed from one lot of grain to the other, highly likely that an impersonal *mana* is so made to pass over.

These are but random specimens; I might go on giving one instance after another of similar procedures from the oldest rites. The Luperci, for example, carried leather thongs heavily charged with fertility-magic; the flamen Dialis was obliged to shun contact with a great number of things containing the wrong kind of *mana*, such as bonds and anything suggesting them, whereby he might be enchained and so impeded in the exercise of his functions; every free-born boy had around his neck the *bulla*, con-

[18] Guil. Henzen, Acta fratrum arualium (Berlin 1874), pp. cciii, 1 (text complete), ccxxv 11, 13 (text restored). Summary of the ritual on p. 11.

[19] Henzen, op. cit., p. cciii, 15 and elsewhere.

taining an amulet[20] which protected him against the dangers attendant on childhood. In form, this was a *turpicula res*, says Varro,[21] presumably a phallus, that world-wide averter of evil and assurer of fertility and maturity; at all events, that was one kind of the *praebia* employed.[22] This and much else were pieces of magic of the respectable kind; Rome knew that the other sort existed, and by the date at all events of the Twelve Tables forbade some kinds of it, the charming away of a neighbor's crops and the utterance of a harmful spell.[23] We thus see that early Roman life was, like that of many early cultures, pervaded with a belief in magical powers, not necessarily connected with the supposed activities of any god, though they might be reinforced by appeal to a deity, and capable of being used against a human being (as the *malum carmen* was), to benefit him, like the boys' amulets, even to impede divine or at all events sacred activities, as in the case of the binding-magic which the flamen Dialis must at all costs avoid. At some time or other, possibly as late as the second century B.C., this power, if it was connected with a god, came to be styled *numen*. What it would be called if it belonged to a sorcerer, we do not know. A later age spoke of the *uirtus* of magical herbs, that is their δύναμις (the existence of this equivalent is one of my reasons for doubting if *numen* really is nothing better than a Latin expression of a Hellenistic idea), or of the *potestates* of healing simples, which amounts to much the same thing.[24] I incline to think that *numen* was still the word, since it can be used metaphorically of the immense influence and power of a ruling body, Senate or people,[25] but I cannot prove this, and it must remain a mere theory, a more or less likely guess, unless and until more evidence comes to light. As I have already emphasized, the verbal point is a minor one; the main thing is the existence of the idea.

Unless, therefore, something more than an argument based on

[20] The chief passages are collected in Marquardt-Mau, Privatleben d. Römer, i, p. 84 and notes.

[21] Varro, de ling. Lat. vii, 97.

[22] Ibid., 107.

[23] XII Tabulae, viii, 1 and 8 (Bruns, in Fontes iuris Romani).

[24] Ovid, Met. xiv, 257; Verg., A. xii, 396.

[25] Cicero, Phil. iii, 32; post red. ad Quirit., 18.

the known date of a word, however important and interesting, can be brought against the position I hold, I shall continue to believe that the most fundamental idea in early Roman religion, the half-conscious assumption underlying much of what they said and did in their relations with their gods and the non-human part of their environment generally, was that expressed at least in classical times by *numen*, that is to say the existence of the sort of power described in my first paragraph and elsewhere by various writers, including myself. The only Latin name I know for this sort of power is *numen* (*uirtus* and *potestas* are late in this sense and belong to the vocabulary of magic or would-be science, not of religious thought). It therefore is at least convenient to use it in referring to the Roman beliefs and consequent rites of early date, and I think it an open question at least whether or not it is historically accurate to use it in speaking of the religion of the first settlers on the Palatine or those who worshipped at the Capitolium Vetus.

ISAIAH 41

CHARLES C. TORREY
Chicago, Illinois

This is a chapter of unique importance for the understanding of the prophey of Second Isaiah. The interpretation of this poem of 29 verses — or, specifically, of its verses 1–3 and 25 f. — carries with it the entire conception of "the Prophet of the Exile"; his quality, his message, the amount of the prophecy that can be assigned to him, and indeed the theory of the origin of chapters 34–66. Two widely different interpretations, the one incompatible with the other, are well established in the history of Old Testament exegesis.

Does the Prophet take his cue from past history, or from current events? It is the one or the other. Is he a great teacher and religious philosopher, or rather the eloquent but shallow enthusiast of whom Bernhard Duhm paints such a painfully convincing picture? [1] The reader of Second Isaiah has come to the point where the road forks, and he must make his choice.

The great prophecy begins, diplomatically,[2] with a picture of the doom of the Gentiles (chapter 34), with Edom, here as elsewhere, typifying the enemies of Israel and of Yahweh. There follows, in chapter 35, a companion picture of beauty and comfort for "the ransomed of Yahweh." As in the preceding chapter, this is all set forth in general terms and in figurative language. The message of comfort is continued in chapter 40, which originally followed immediately upon chapter 35.[3] Here also, at first, the poet's imagination creates a series of pictures, as before, but he soon comes to a full and vigorous statement of his fundamental thesis, that Yahweh is the God of the world, of the universe, the *only* God.

All this is preliminary to the Prophet's argument from history, which begins with chapter 41. *What* history, and how effective the argument, are questions which remain to be answered.

[1] Das Buch Jesaia, in the introduction to chapters 40 ff., in the notes on 41:4, 12 ff., 21 ff., etc. See also the third edition, p. 280, below.

[2] See the Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. 57 (1938), p. 138, footnote.

[3] See the J.B.L., Vol. 57, p. 126 f., and the literature there referred to.

Chapter 41 begins at once with actualities, with a great personage and his well known deeds, with a turning point in history. The individual who is brought before us in verses 2 f. and 25 f. is a famous champion who *has trampled on kings*. He came from the east and the north, calling on the name of Yahweh. He was summoned from the east by Yahweh, who called him to his service, and the fact that he was chosen and supported by the God of Israel is well known to all the world, even to "the isles of the sea" (אִיִּים, verses 1, 5) and "the ends of the earth."

Who is this great one? He appears again, unmistakably, in chapter 45, presumably in other chapters also, since his person is of universal significance. As already observed, there are two very different answers, both definite and of long standing. The official Jewish tradition, embodied in the Targum, says *Abraham*; the accepted modern interpretation says *Cyrus*. The answer is profoundly important, not merely for the message of this prophet but also for all the later literature of the Old Testament and for the interpretation of the Four Gospels.

It would seem to be an easy matter, and quite sufficient, to put the two interpretations side by side, comparing them in one particular after another, to see which of the two heroes was intended by the author of this chapter. The matter is not so simple, however.

The hero of chapter 41 is, beyond all question, the hero of chapter 45, and the latter is expressly named in our Hebrew text as the Persian king, Cyrus. This information comes in suddenly and quite unexpectedly, to be sure. From the beginning of chapter 34 to the last verses of chapter 44 there is nothing to suggest the atmosphere of the 6th century B.C., no allusion to conditions or events in Babylonia,[4] nothing whatever to indicate that the Prophet's hearers are anywhere else than in Jerusalem. The capital city is taken for granted, as in 40:2 where it stands for Israel;

[4] The curiously tinkered verse 43:14 forms no exception. Here the exiles in "the north, the south, the east, and the west" (verses 5 f.) *are brought home to Palestine "in ships,"* just as in chapter 60; but the proper names "Babylon" and "Chaldea," thrown in for good measure, create chaos, as any commentary will testify. The same superfluous and disturbing pair, *Babel-Kasdīm*, will be found inserted in two other places, 48:14, 20. The two words also appear significantly in *athbash* disguise in Jer. 51:1, 41.

in 40:9, where it is pictured as a maiden mounting a high hill to give glad news to the cities of Judah; and in 48:2, where "the holy city" certainly seems real and at hand.

Thus far, then, up to the end of chapter 44, there had seemed to be no background for the Persian king and his conquests, *nothing* that could naturally suggest the circumstances of his time. Now, however, in 44:28, 45:1, and occasionally elsewhere in the near sequel, there is a new element in the prophecy.

Aside from the definite statement, twice made, that the Anointed of Yahweh, the champion whose right hand he holds, the shepherd who will accomplish his great purpose for Israel, is Cyrus, there are also a few other passages and one entire verse (45:13) which seem to bring us into the first chapters of the book of Ezra, and to show that the Prophet's chief concern (as then would be shown also by chapter 41) is the building of the temple in Jerusalem by Cyrus,[5] the confessed worshipper of Yahweh.

The Hebrew text is supported by all the ancient versions, and this fact has been held to preclude criticism here. There is therefore no need, it would seem, to pay attention to the old Jewish exegesis, which visualized in chapter 41 a Hebrew champion rather than a Persian. And in fact, the *typical* modern commentary on Isaiah *never mentions this Targumic interpretation at all.* Even if the nature of it is known, no one (as far as I am aware) has ever discussed it, to see how well Abraham fits into the crucial passages of chapter 41!

A few scholars have refused to see the question settled in this easy way, but have insisted, on the contrary, that the disagreeing verdict must be taken into account; urging moreover that the background of Cyrus and his day is demonstrably false; and that a great prophecy has been ruined, its bulk reduced to fragments and its arguments made ridiculous, by a few palpable insertions in the Hebrew text. This matter of later additions must be given brief mention here.

[5] The passage 43:22 ff. shows that the temple had long been built. It is obvious that verses 23a and 24a must be taken *as questions*; but however that may be, the evidence is clear that the sacrifices of the temple were in full operation at the time when chapter 43 was written.

With the end of the nineteenth century, when the writings of the Hebrew prophets began to be studied as poetry in metric form, one important criterion for recognizing interpolations came plainly into view, and has since then been employed. It is often possible to say with practical certainty that this or that single word is secondary where the metric line is plainly overloaded and there is some other cogent reason for suspecting interpolation. Every important commentary or technical treatise in this field contains examples of the sort. It touches upon our present problem.

For example, the late Professor Armand Kaminka, a well-known Viennese scholar and teacher, in his book entitled Le Prophète Isaïe (Paris, Geuthner, 1925), sees no Cyrus in 41:2 f. nor in 45:1. In dealing with the latter passage, on pages 39–41, he remarks that it is easy to see from the rhythm that the word לכורש ("to Cyrus") is a later insertion in the Hebrew text. When it is removed, the stanza is in regular form; and he prints it. He recognizes (ibid.) the preceding part of the same interpolation in 44:28, and calls attention, as other commentators do, to the awkwardness of the verse and the futility of its second half.[6]

Others, not a few, have found the first metric line of 45:1 overloaded. The more closely one studies the details of Hebrew versification, the more certain he will be that "to Cyrus" is a later interpretation. These are high-sounding verses, in which the author's emotion can be felt, and in all such passages the rhythm is regular, never overloaded. Some would make the troublesome word here end the *first* verse-member, others would make it begin the *second* member. In either case the half-verse is out of rhythm and the eloquence of a fine passage is *gone*; as to that, there can be no question.

It nevertheless remains to be seen, from a new examination of the parallel passages celebrating the conqueror, namely 41:2 ff., 25 ff., and 45:1 ff., what ground (aside from the twice-written name) there is for recognizing the presence of Cyrus in this great prophecy.

[6] Professor Kaminka's main purpose, to show the possibility of a single author for both halves of the book, could not interest me especially. It was his feeling of the false rhythm in 45:1 that caught my attention.

The Targumic passages which flatly contradict the verdict of modern criticism have been completely ignored in modern times, as was remarked above. This is because of the historical situation (uniquely interesting and important!) seemingly provided by 45:1–5 and the book of Ezra, and because of the possibility of finding this situation presupposed in a few chapters, or parts of chapters, in this portion of the book of Isaiah. Even with this inspiring scene in view, however, it might have seemed indispensable to take notice of the verdict of the early Jewish scholars, particularly when it was seen that they took pains to repeat (several times) and emphasize their conclusion, that there might be no mistake.

They had before them the same Hebrew text that we have, and when they came to 44:28 and 45:1, they took what was given them, but without ever enlarging upon it or making later use of it. Thus in 46:11 there is no thought of Cyrus; similarly in 48:14 ff. the interpretation goes back to chapter 41. The one whom Yahweh "loved" (48:14) and called was "Abraham your father"; this is said twice, evidently for emphasis. The scholars of the Targum expressly stand by their interpretation.

On what grounds, then, did Israel's exegetes decide that the great personage of Is. 41:2 f. and 25 f. is Abraham? Any careful study of this question will be found enlightening. Let us see what the Prophet has to say, and what situation is most naturally suggested by his words. The most ancient interpretation shall be given its first formal test in modern times.

The picture is generally clear and twice drawn, at the beginning of the poem and at the end. Yahweh brings proof of his supreme power, proof which will be universally recognized as valid. He called to his service "one" from the east, who heard the call and obeyed, one who trampled on kings. This last item of the characterization is made especially prominent in both passages, the opening and the closing. It appears again in the parallel passage 45:1, where Yahweh holds the right hand of his anointed one,

> To subdue nations before him,
> And to loosen the loins of kings.

It is the thing which all the world could see, a happening which must make its profound impression.

Cyrus the Persian came from the east, and in his triumphant career of conquest he humbled kings and princes. The onslaught of his armies took Western Asia by surprise. It is represented as in its earlier stages; the parallel passage 45:1 ff. shows that the campaign was in progress, and that the richest cities were still to be looted.[7]

Abraham likewise came from the east, from Ur of the Chaldees, and in his subsequent career, as narrated in the 14th chapter of Genesis, he subdued the five greatest kings of the earth, who are expressly named. He not only put their armies to the sword, but also took all their spoil away from them (verses 16 and 17).

Thus far, there is not much to choose, between the claims of Cyrus and those of Abraham. There are, however, other features of the description which must be taken into account.

Yahweh's helper was summoned "from the north" (verse 25) as well as "from the east" (both regions named). It has been suggested that Cyrus might be said to have come from the northeast; but this would be a strange thing to say, under the circumstances, and it is not at all a natural way of understanding our Hebrew text. It must not be forgotten that Abraham was not only brought from the east, from Ur of the Chaldees (Gen. 11:31; 15:7), but was also summoned from Haran in the north (Gen. 12:1 ff.). The call of Abraham from Haran was especially impressive and prophetic, see Gen. 12:2 f.! The Jews were fond of referring to it, as in Acts 3:25 for example. The natural conclusion is, that Abraham, not Cyrus, is referred to in Is. 41:25.

Again, in the same verse, it is said that the one who was brought from a distant land came "calling on the name" of Yahweh. The trouble which this has made for the commentators is well set forth in Marti's Buch Jesaja, pp. 283 f. The phrase means that Cyrus "ruft den Namen Jahwes an beim Kultus." To explain this as meaning that the Persian king convinced *later on* by the won-

[7] It is remarkable that a Hebrew writer in the 6th century B.C., one who was familiar (as this writer certainly was) with the religious literature of his people, could represent Yahweh as rejoicing in pillage and plunder, whether by Israel or by Gentiles. Commentators have suggested that Israel was to have the benefit of this loot; how, is not clear.

derful success of his conquests that Yahweh is the supreme and only God (so Duhm and others, citing 45:6) is not fair to the present context. Emendation of the text is therefore felt to be necessary, and Cheyne and Marti propose to read: "From the east *I* have called him by *his* name." The Massoretic Hebrew, however, is clear and idiomatic, and the grounds given for altering it hardly merit respect.

The immediate conclusion cannot be in doubt: whoever may be the hero of 41:2 f., the hero of 41:25 is Abraham, whom the description fits with startling clearness. Cyrus, on the other hand, seems to be excluded; it is only by taking liberties with the Hebrew that he can be given a place in the Prophet's picture.

It is now noticeable, even surprising, that the initial challenge to the Gentiles in 41:1, 5 is addressed to the isles of the sea (אִיִּים) and the ends of the earth (קְצוֹת הָאָרֶץ). If the Prophet is speaking in 540 B.C., as the commentators say, voicing his enthusiasm over the victories of a distant tyrant, why does he go so far abroad for his audience? The "isles" and the "ends of the earth" can have known at this time nothing whatever about the exploits of Cyrus, nor could they have been concerned when they did at length hear of them.

To interpose, that these remote regions are named merely in hyperbole, as a natural way of saying that all the world will see the hand of Yahweh the God of the Hebrew people in Cyrus' conquests, is hardly fair to the Prophet and to the picture which he has drawn. Verses 5–7 represent the isles and the ends of the earth as hearing the challenge with apprehension, and proceeding at once to prepare a reply. Unless this was at the time when the challenge was delivered, the picture is senseless.

Had the isles of the sea reason for interest in the career of Abraham? All the peoples of the earth knew that the Jews were his children. His conquest of the five great kings (Gen. 14) was a world-shaking event. The rescue of Israel from Egypt, with the destruction of Pharaoh's army, was a fact familiar to the Gentiles. The Hebrew prophets took mournful pleasure in their knowledge that the chosen people were scattered abroad, to be found in every corner of the inhabited earth (Is. 43:5 f., 49:12, Jer. 46:28, Micah 7:12). In the great day, now just dawning (the

Prophet says), the exiles will be brought home *in ships* (Is. 43:14, 60:4, 9). Abraham then, was already known to the אִיִּים; and there is more to be said. Other important features of the Prophet's picture are now clear for the first time (that is, to modern readers; they were clear to the ancient Jewish exegetes).

A prominent feature of Second Isaiah's argument, especially in chapters 41–48, is his appeal to *the beginning* (or *beginnings*), with or without allusion to the contrasted *ending*, the things which are to come. This appears in every one of the chapters named, with the exception of 47. The words used are רֹאשׁ, רֵאשִׁית, רִאשׁוֹן, ראשנות, and קדם (מקדם parallel to מראשית in 46:10; and the same in 45:21, cf. 41:26). The "beginning" *of what?*

Words from the list just given occur four times in chapter 41, always with emphasis, and always in connection with the call of the great one from the east and north. It is obvious, needing no argument, that the portentous beginning, in this chapter and in the several closely parallel passages, is *the call of Abraham*. The "former things," frequently mentioned, are his marvelous career and the equally stirring fortunes of his children. This beginning and these former things have been well known, the Prophet reiterates, to the Hebrew people, who at one time are summoned by Yahweh to remember them (46:9), and at another time to forget them (43:18). Yahweh had announced them "from the beginning" (41:26; 44:8; 45:21). He made clear promises — wonderful promises — to Israel. "From the beginning I spoke openly, not in secret" (48:16). "I spoke not in secret, I said not to the seed of Jacob, seek me for nothing!" (45:19).

This "beginning," which is made so prominent, so often reiterated, makes trouble for the commentators, for it stands quite apart from Cyrus and his deeds, and brings confusion into contexts which are supposed to contain mention of him. An example or two may be given from Marti's commentary,[8] mentioned above.

The four examples in chapter 41 are typical, in different ways. In verse 4, רֹאשׁ is in these days taken to mean the creation of the world, and the argument is thus reduced to folly: "Deutero-Isaiah and his people are so sure that Yahweh's hand has guided

[8] Prof. Karl Marti's Das Buch Jesaja (Tübingen, 1900) is an especially thorough and sober work, well fitted to represent modern criticism since Duhm.

human history that the mere statement of the fact must convince the Gentiles" (p. 279, middle). — Verse 22, הראשנות (compare 42:9; 43:9; 46:9 f.; 48:3!) is similarly treated: it is either made perfectly indefinite ("Vergangenes") or else is thought to refer to "predictions" by prophets; and the argument is again rendered futile. — Verse 26: "Which one of the foreign gods announced *beforehand* the conquests of Cyrus?" But מראש does not mean *im voraus*, it means "from the beginning" — which the modern commentator finds impossible here. See Marti's comment on 48:16, where the same מראש in a parallel context is pronounced, on no other evidence than its "difficulty," a later addition to the text (p. 324, below). — Verse 27. This verse is transparent to those who know that the great beginning was the call of Abraham. The best parallel is 42:9: "Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare." Closely similar also is 48:3–6. What the new things are to be, was declared in 42:6–8, the light given through Israel to the Gentiles. In like manner, after the very emphatic announcement of new things in the parallel passage 48:3–6, the "light to the Gentiles" follows in chapter 49.

Thus 41:27 says, in almost the very words of 42:9, "The beginnings of Zion, behold them! and I give to Jerusalem a herald of good tidings." But the modern commentary can do nothing with this ראשון except to mistranslate it (see page 284, middle) as equivalent to *"schon zuvor"* and to pronounce the Hebrew text corrupt.

The many passages dealing with the "beginnings" give a clear and consistent picture, *and they justify fully the ancient Jewish interpretation.* The hero is Abraham, there is no place for Cyrus. A few other items in the chapter remain to be considered.

Second Isaiah, as a poet, had his own ways of picturing what he saw, the poet's preference for figures of speech, for variety in the verbal dress of his message.

Immediately after the introductory paragraph of chapter 41 the Prophet tells, as in duty bound, the *name* of the mysterious personage whom he presented in verse 2. The reader, or hearer, could not possibly be expected to wait through a number of successive chapters without even a definite hint! Accordingly we

are told in verses 8 and 9 who it was whom Yahweh called from the east "to his service" (לרגלו, verse 2). It was "Israel, my servant, ... *whom I plucked from the ends of the earth and called from its farthest corners, and said to thee, Thou art my servant.*"

This might well seem to be decisive; but Marti, following Duhm and Cheyne, would omit the Hebrew rendered by the words here italicized as a "Randbemerkung über Abraham"!

The term "servant," as all students of the Old Testament know, is used by this poet in an individual and significant way. Often, needless to say, the word in one of its most general connotations designates Israel, *the people*, as Yahweh's worshippers. Thus it is in the verses now before us. Once or twice it is all Israel with a definitely indicated task, as in 50:4 ff. and 52:13–53:12. Again, there are several highly important passages, characteristic of this one writer, in which the term "Servant" denotes the personal *representative* of the chosen people, the long-promised Coming One, soon to appear. The representative may be conceived as messenger (42:19), or administrator, or military captain, and the title "servant" is sometimes accompanied with a freely coined proper name; thus *Yĕshūrūn*, 44:2; *Mĕshullam*, 42:19; *Yaskīl*, 52:13.

Israel is destined to administer justice for all the world (42:1, 4), and in chapter 42 the Servant is obviously conceived as a person. Israel is also destined to "thresh mountains" (41:15), and in verse 25b the same thing is said in other picturesque phrases: "He shall come upon rulers as the potter treads clay." Here, with the battle, comes in the captain. There can be no warfare, no triumph, without *a leader*, and in every prediction of Israel's victory over enemies the Prophet certainly had the leader more or less distinctly in mind.

What was the picture which he drew for himself? The answer is easy, and there can be but one answer. The coming warrior imagined could only be the promised scion of David's royal line (2 Sam. 7:12–16; 23:5), the promise expressly claimed in chapter 55, verses 3–5. Those who recognize the interpolation of "Cyrus" in 45:1 see the coming Hebrew prince here referred to by his most suitable title (see אכנן, verse 4), the "anointed" one.

The military leader of this chapter appears in chapter 49 as the civil leader. The person is the same, and so also is the purpose: "for Jacob my servant's sake and Israel my chosen" (45:4); "to bring Jacob again to him, and that Israel be gathered unto him" (49:5).

This warlike section of chapter 41, verses 10–16, in which Israel is pictured as doing battle, has still other brief parallels in subsequent chapters, 49:24–26; 54:14–17.

The leader, the captain, is ready and will be sent whenever the people are prepared. That time seems far distant, but Yahweh says repeatedly in these chapters that he will accomplish his purpose, even while Israel is still poor in faith and unfit for its mission. For his love of his people, for the sake of his name (48:9, 11), he must act.

The Prophet is true to his calling. He sees before him a picture of desperate unworthiness, even of apostasy. The chosen people are blind, deaf, and unfaithful; in some considerable part adherents of foreign cults (shown by many passages, such as 46:6–8 and 48:5), and withal stubbornly arrogant (48:5–8). *They do not yet know Yahweh* (40:21, 27 f.), do not even understand that they are being punished (42:23 f.). They have thought to appease their God with sacrifices, but have only wearied him with their iniquities 43:22–24). They seem in danger of forgetting Yahweh altogether (44:21), and are so far away that he can cry out to them, "Return to me!" (44:22). They are evil-doers, פושעים, far from righteousness (46:8, 12). They have no right to call themselves Yahweh's people, *nor to claim Jerusalem, the holy city, as their true home* (48:1 f.).

The imagined Representative, as one of the people, must share their qualities, the bad and the good. "Who is as blind and deaf as the Servant of Yahweh?" He has seen great things, but has not understood them (42:19 f.). In 45:4 f. Yahweh says to him, "I have called thee by thy name, entitled thee,[9] though thou hast not known me; . . . . I will gird thee,[10] *though thou knowest me*

[9] Calling by name signifies a close and intimate relation. Thus, 43:1, Yahweh says to Israel, "I have called thee by thy name, *thou art mine.*" See also Ex. 31:2. The title is of course "Anointed one," see above.

[10] So David is represented as saying, in Psalm 18:33, "God *girdeth* me with strength."

not." The Coming One still had much to learn before he could undertake his mission, see 50:4b, 5, and 49:4. When, however, girt for victory, he at length shall be threshing mountains, the foreign peoples who had seen "the beginnings of Zion" will all, "from the rising of the sun to the west," acknowledge that Yahweh is the only God (45:6). This is the argument also in 41:22–25.

The "everlasting covenant" with David (ברית עולם, 2 Sam. 23:5, Is. 55:3) is always in mind throughout these chapters. The deliverer to be sent, popularly known as the מלאך הברית (Mal. 3:1), is here referred to by the single word מלאך, Messenger, parallel to Servant, in 42:19.

There are two passages in this 41st chapter which have a certain bearing on the alternative, "Cyrus or Israel," which has been found in subsequent chapters. Who was it whom Yahweh loved, who had the honor of being especially his friend (אהב)? In 41:8 Yahweh speaks of "Abraham my friend," Ἀβραὰμ ὃν ἠγάπησα, and in 43:4 the same thing is said of Israel: "Thou art precious in my sight, ... and I have loved thee." These sayings, especially the former, were cherished by the Israelite people, and we see mention of "Abraham *the friend of God*" in 2 Chr. 20:7 and James 2:23.

In 48:14 we read again of "him whom Yahweh loves." Who is the loved one? The immediate context brings us back to 41:4, 25–27. The scene is the same, and so also are the familiar phrases. It was I, Yahweh says, who "declared these things." I called him, I brought him. "Come near me, hear this; from the beginning (מראש) I spoke not in secret."

The collocation of the "loved one" with the announcement to Israel "*at the beginning*" should leave no particle of doubt as to the personage who is intended, and the Targum, here also, says "Abraham." Modern exegesis says "Cyrus," but not without some uneasiness. As was shown above, the troublesome מראש is expunged, as possibly coming from a marginal gloss! The phrase "Yahweh loved him" is made harmless in Marti's commentary in the following manner: "Yahweh" is omitted; another verb is substituted, by mere conjecture, for "loved"; and the phrase is made a question: "Who brought him?" (page 324).

The two proper names, *Babel-Kasdīm* in collocation, the one balanced against the other, are as out of place and disturbing here as they were seen to be in 43:14. See also below.

The other passage is 41:13 (see also verse 10), and this time it is Yahweh's "right-hand man," interpreted as Israel, who is mentioned. In 42:6 he appears as Israel's personal representative, the Servant. Yahweh says, "I took thee by the hand, and have kept thee, I have made thee my pledge to the peoples, the light of the nations, to open the sightless eyes," etc. In 45:1 he appears once more, this time in a picture of his mission *exactly like that which was presented in 41:13*. There, he was being prepared for battle and conquest, "to thresh mountains and beat them small"; here, his right hand is held with the same purpose: to subdue nations and loosen the loins of kings. Did Yahweh have more than one right-hand man whom he was training for military conquest? On the contrary, we certainly must see here (as also in 41:13) the Davidic champion, the Anointed one, the Messenger of the Covenant.

It was remarked above, in a footnote, that the *pair* of proper names, *Babel-Kasdīm* (Babylon and Chaldea) has been inserted with disturbing result into three passages in chapters 43 and 48.

The first of the three, 43:14, dealing with remote lands and the return to Jerusalem *in ships*, is so evidently spoiled by the interpolation that no argument was necessary.

The second passage, 48:14, declaring the divine purpose in the calling of Abraham, "whom Yahweh loved," has just been considered. The original reading of verse 14b appears to have been the following:

האל יהוה אהבו יעשה חפצו וזרעו

The One God,[11] Yahweh, loved him; He will execute his pleasure and his might.

The remaining passage, 48:20, though not directly connected with chapter 41, needs to be included here. The Prophet has been rebuking his people unsparingly in this 48th chapter, yet saying

[11] The Hebrew text is not quite in order. For את read זאת; with האל יהוה compare 42:5.

that Yahweh, for his name's sake, will not "cut them off," but will complete what he planned. In verses 18 f. there is a return to the reproach: "Oh that you had hearkened to my commandments! then had your peace been as a river" . . . . "the name [of your children] would not be cut off nor destroyed from before me." Then comes one of the dramatic outbursts so characteristic of this poet, reminding his hearers of "the former things," of the Flight from Egypt. Compare the rhapsodies in 51:9; 52:11; 57:14; 62:10. The Exodus was depicted in 43:14–17, as it is in the present passage and in 52:11 f.

The original text of 48:20:

צאו ברחו בקול רנה הגידו השמיעו זאת
הוציאוה עד קצה הארץ גאל יהוה עבדו יעקב

Go forth, flee,[12] with a shout of joy,
Proclaim this, make it known;
Bring it forth to the end of the earth:
"Yahweh redeemed his servant Jacob!" [13]

[12] The Hebrew verb used here (as in Ex. 14:5) reminds at once of the "flight" from Egypt.

[13] It will be worth while to pause for a moment over this exhortation to Israel, to proclaim to the world what Yahweh has done for his people. Similar is verse 6: You have heard and seen all this, and will you not declare it? The deliverance of Israel from Egypt was a theme of which the prophets and psalmists never tired. Allusions to it appear on page after page, neither Israelites nor Gentiles could be allowed to forget it.

According to Marti's Jesaja, page 297, the rescue from Babylonia was "a greater wonder" than the exodus from Egypt. Why, then, did the spokesmen of Israel fail to "declare it"? In an earlier day, when it was believed that no canonical Hebrew literature was written later than the early Persian period, the question was not difficult to answer. Now that it is known that the greater part of the Hebrew Bible was written *after* the time of Cyrus, including much of the prophetic literature and practically all of the Psalter, the matter becomes truly mysterious. Were the Jews the utterly apathetic and ungrateful people that this silence would make them?

Was there not, for example, a "Trito-Isaiah," the author of many long chapters, and an imitator (it is said) of Second Isaiah? He makes no mention of the marvelous Restoration from Babylonia. In chapters 61 and 62 he had excellent opportunity. In 63:11–14 he invokes passionately the God who brought Israel home through the Sinai desert; it is utterly incredible that he should have failed here to mention the "greater miracle," if he had ever heard of it. Such Psalms as 105–107, 114, 135 and 136, had need of this wonderful illustration of Yahweh's care of his people. If their authors knew of it, how could they possibly refrain from "bringing it forth to the end of the earth"?

Daniel, in chapter 9, knows that his people *are in the home land, in Judah and Jerusalem* (see verses 7 and 16!), but for the renown (שם) of the God of Israel he

The wonders in the wilderness are accordingly brought to memory, as in 63:11–14; the picture which beyond all others must thrill the people. But the Prophet, as in duty bound, ends with a sharp word of warning: "No peace for the wicked!" He had called his hearers פושעים (46:8).

The *Babel-Kasdīm* insertion here in the Hebrew text would change the flight from Egypt into a return from Babylonia — in complete disregard of the context! This threefold and always disturbing interpolation (in 43:14, 48:14, and 48:20) is most instructive. That it *is* a later improvement of the text, no one could possibly doubt who has studied the three examples. Some one wished to make plain what was obscure, to give support to the "Cyrus" of 44:28 and 45:1, but the result merely made plainer the fact that Cyrus has no place whatever in these chapters, nor have the events of his time.

It is quite evident that chapters 46 and 47 were not uttered by a prophet who saw a victorious Cyrus approaching Babylonia! There is no hint of *impending* doom, no apparent expectation of it, in either chapter. Bel and Nebo are feeble "gods"; they cannot carry their worshippers (as Yahweh carries Israel), but fall down under the weight. They cannot even rescue themselves, if a foe comes. The proud city Babylon is doomed to fall, but in a perfectly indefinite future. The blow will come "suddenly," but there is nowhere any threat of its coming "soon." These chapters were certainly *not* written in the time of Cyrus.

There is yet one more bit of evidence in chapter 41, an item not touched upon in the preceding pages, which makes known, with unusual distinctness, what warrior is intended in verses 2 f. Why does the Prophet represent Yahweh as taking pleasure in the hero's *pursuit* of his victims (verse 3)? Could not the God of all the earth be satisfied with the slaughtering and plundering of these wretched kings and princes, without needing to see the conqueror

---

can only point to the rescue from Egypt (verse 15). In chapter 10 (third year of Cyrus) neither Daniel nor the angel who talks with him shows any knowledge of the events narrated in Ezra, chapters 1 ff., Persia is simply the typical enemy. Why is it, that there is in the Hebrew Bible no allusion to the great Return except in the writings of the Chronicler? There is only one possible answer, and it comes clear from every side: Because there *was* no Return.

chase them? If Cyrus had been in the Prophet's mind, the question would be troublesome.

The fact is, very obviously, that we are back in the 14th chapter of Genesis, where the most conspicuous feature of this narrative is Abraham's *pursuit* of the five kings. They had many hours the start, so that he and his little army, after a forced march, could overtake them only at Dan. After defeating them there, he continued the pursuit even beyond Damascus!

The question of the hero of chapter 41 is settled once for all and beyond controversy. The verdict carries with it the interpretation of 45:1 ff., as has been abundantly shown in detail. The twice-appearing name, "Cyrus," is a later insertion in the Hebrew text, and scholarly exegesis can make no use of it.[14]

The repeated verdict of the Targum — of the learned Jews of its time — is vindicated at every point. The enthusiasm of Second Isaiah is not for a foreign conqueror, but for a marvelous record of divine guidance, and for great leaders in the dim distance, past and future.

[14] Cyrus will be retained, it is needless to say, in all popular texts and treatises, in the multitude of quasi-scientific publications, and by the many scholars who refuse to examine any new evidence which overthrows long-accepted beliefs. The figure of the foreign liberator is far too romantic to be given up by the public, and the central importance which he has had in the history of Hebrew literature insures his retention in the standard textbooks for many years to come. It is most unfortunate, but inevitable. Though a matter of the highest importance, it can hardly be given notice in the present generation.

ABRAHAM'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

In a note, "Abraham and the Quest for God," in the Harvard Theological Review, XXVIII (1935) 55–60, Wilfred L. Knox makes the illuminating point that Diaspora Judaism and Rabbinic Judaism diverge in the matter of what called forth Abraham's call from God. The rabbis, Knox points out, stress that Abraham was pre-destined for the call, while the hellenists of the Diaspora credit Abraham with a voluntary abandonment of astrology, and thereby Abraham merits the call. The rabbis, then, not faced with the need of explaining Abraham's call to proselytes, simply have recourse to pre-destination; the hellenists, confronted by prospective proselytes, stress Abraham's reward for his search. "The Judaism of the Dispersion was concerned to make converts; it had to recognize that cosmic and astral interpretations of Gentile cults which tended towards monotheism were nearer to the truth, if only they were harder to convict of error, than the Olympian theology or the cruder forms of Polytheism." The reward which Abraham received for abandoning astrology would similarly be held out as within the potential grasp of Gentile inquirers who would also abandon error. So far Knox.

There is considerable acuteness in Knox's observation. But there are two comments which seem in order. First, from the rabbinic side, there is ample material which reflects the view that Abraham merited the divine call. Thus, Abraham recognized that there must be a God, and thereupon God revealed himself to Abraham.[1] Abraham was already a vial of fragrant perfume, lying unnoticed in obscurity, when the divine command to leave home came to him.[2] While Knox is correct in saying that the rabbis usually conceive of Abraham as pre-destined, that is not exclusively the rabbinic view.

Secondly, from the hellenistic side, Knox relies upon passages in Philo (Migr. 3ff; 32ff; and Gig. 13ff) to show that in Philo's view Abraham first did something, and then merited the divine call. Knox is correct that these passages have such a tenor. But that is not the whole story about Philo.

In Leg. All., III, 77ff., Philo is discussing the fact that "God . . . promoted goodly natures apart from any manifest reason." Noah (Gen. VI 8) found grace (*charis*) in the sight of the Lord God when he had

[1] Genesis Rabbah (Theodor's Edition), XXXIX, 1. Cf. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, V, 217–218.

[2] Genesis Rabbah, XXXIX, 2.

as yet done no worthy deed. To find favor, says Philo, is different from and goes beyond being "well-pleasing." "The righteous man exploring the nature of existences, makes a surprising *find*, in this one discovery, that all things are a *grace* of God, and that creation has no gift of grace to bestow, for neither has it any possession. . . ."

Philo then points to Melchizedek, who for no known reason, is produced to begin with as a king and worthy of priesthood. And next, "What good thing had Abraham already done, that he bids him estrange himself from fatherland and kindred there and dwell in whatever land God Himself may give him?" And turning to Isaac, Philo says ". . . some even before their birth God endows with a goodly form and equipment, and has determined that they shall have a most excellent portion. . . . What is it, then, that has made this one too to be praised before his birth?" Similarly, Philo treats of Jacob, Ephraim, and Moses.

It is, accordingly, not appropriate to press too far the contrast which Knox appropriately finds. Philo [3] and the rabbis are not too far apart in their statements relative to "free-will" and "determinism," if we may use such abstractions to describe rabbinic thinking.[4]

But however similar Philo and the rabbis are in these notions in general, they are far apart in the description of specifically how Abraham came to discover God, and the significant difference is worth noting. Philo speaks of a Bezalel class [5] which discerns God "as it were from a shadow, from created things by virtue of a process of reasoning." The rabbinic explanation of Abraham's discovery of God is completely in accord with the Philonic Bezalel type of mind. So, similarly, this discovery, as related by Josephus,[6] stems from Abraham's observation of the aberrations in the movements of the heavenly bodies.

But Philo's praise of Abraham stems from the conviction that Abraham abandoned the Chaldean way of "fixing his thoughts on the choric movement of the stars with no apprehension at all of an harmonious and intelligible order of things outside the world and sphere of sense." [7] Abraham turned instead to examine himself, and discovering that an invisible mind within him ruled the community of the body, inferred that the world similarly has a king who holds it together and directs it justly.[8] Abraham, then, did not use the dubious method

[3] Cf. Wolfson, Philo, I, 450ff; and Moore, "Fate and Free Will in Josephus," Harvard Theological Review, XXII (1929), 371–389.

[4] Cf. Moore, op. cit., especially 380–385.

[5] Leg. All. III, 102.

[6] Ant. I, vii, 1.

[7] De Abrahamo, 77.

[8] Ibid., 72–74; Gig., 62–64.

which for the astrologers led to identifying the world with God, and which, for the Bezalel class, led to discerning God by means of his works, and to the knowledge only of God's Logos. By a different method Abraham went, beyond the Logos, to the Truly Existent.

From Philo's standpoint, the way of the rabbis or of Josephus is only a second-best way; Philo's Abraham had the true and best way. On another occasion there will be things to say on the significance of this striking difference between Philo and the rabbis.

SAMUEL SANDMEL

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

Addendum to Article by N. H. Baynes in April 1951 Number pp. 93–106

The defence of the icons employed against the Jews was used precisely in the same form against the Turks by Gregory Palamas when a prisoner in Nicaea in the year 1355. See G. G. Arnakis, Gregory Palamas among the Turks, Speculum 26 (1951) p. 108.

BOOKS RECEIVED

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF MAN. *By C. Ryder Smith.* London, Epworth Press, [1951]. xiii, 274 p. 18/6.

A CRITIQUE OF JEAN-PAUL SARTRE'S ONTOLOGY. *By Maurice Natanson.* Lincoln, University of Nebraska, 1951. vi, 136 p. $1.00.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ARISTOTLE ILLUSTRATED FROM THE EARLIEST BOOKS OF THE PHYSICS. *Door Howard Evan Runner.* Kampen, Kok, 1951. 160 p.

DAS EVANGELIUM. *Von Paul Schütz.* Tübingen, Katzmann, 1951. 434 p. DM 9.80.

GOSPEL AND THE LAW. *By Charles H. Dodd.* N. Y., Columbia University, 1951. 83 p. $1.50.

DIE HIMMLISCHE WELT IM URCHRISTENTUM UND SPÄTJUDENTUM. Tübingen, Mohr, 1951. vi, 295 p. DM 24.

SUR L'INCOMPREHENSIBILITE DE DIEU. *Par Jean Chrysostome.* Paris, Editions du Cerf, 1951. 316 p.

AN INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY. *By Edgar Sheffield Brightman.* N. Y., Holt, [1951]. xvii, 349 p. $3.60.

ISAÏE. *Traduit par le R. R. P. Auvray et J. Steinmann.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1951. 249 p. 510 fr.

LETTER TO THE JEWS OF YEMEN. *By Moses ben Maimon.* (Iggereth Temen), ed. by Solomon Goldman. N. Y., Histadruth Ivrith of America, 1950. xxxiv, 205 p. (Title page and text in Hebrew.)

LE LEVITIQUE. *Traduit par H. Cazelles.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1951. 131 p. 270 fr.

LE LIVRE DE JONAS. *Traduit par A. Feuillet.* Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1951. 34 p. 75 fr.

MARSILIUS OF PADUA. The defender of peace. Volume I: Marsilius of Padua and medieval political philosophy. *By Alan Gewirth.* N. Y., Columbia University, 1951. xi, 342 p. $4.75.

MORALS AND REVELATION. *By H. D. Lewis.* London, Allen and Unwin, [1951]. ix, 258 p. $3.75.

DAS NEUE MARIEN-DOGMA. *Von Hermann Volk.* Münster, Regensberg, 1951. 135 p. DM 2, 80.

THE RELIGIOUS FOUNDATIONS OF LEVELLER DEMOCRACY. *By D. B. Robertson.* N. Y., Columbia University Press, 1951. 175 p. $2.75.

SOLOVJEV UND DER PROTESTANTISMUS. *Von Ludolf Müller.* Freiburg, Herder. 1951. 182 p. 6,50 DM.

EL VALOR DINAMICO DEL NOMBRE DIVINO EN EL ANTIGUO TESTAMENTO. *Por R. Criado, S. I.* Granada, Camacho, 1950. 29 p.

LE VERBE DE VIE. *Par Ivan Kologrivof.* Bruges, Beyaert, 1951. xxv, 260 p.